DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 420 FL 027 857

AUTHOR	Bernhardt, Elizabeth
TITLE	Research into the Teaching of Literature in a Second Language: What It Says and How To Communicate It to Graduate Students.
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	17p.; In: SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues. Issues in Language Program Direction: A Series of Annual Volumes; see FL 027 849.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Students; Higher Education; Language Teachers; *Literature; Preservice Teacher Education; *Second Language Instruction; *Student Centered Curriculum; Student Teachers

ABSTRACT

This paper asserts that graduate students in foreign language departments need to be prepared to teach language and literature, suggesting that in the traditional literature class, there is a focus on content rather than on the students and that graduate students can be taught to adapt the student-centered approaches typical of the language classroom to the literature classroom. It explains that graduate students are often socialized into the "lang-lit split" in the traditional methods course and that it is important to help them "see that the acts of language and literature teaching are far more alike than they are different." Finally, the paper proposes that the collaboration between language and literature can begin with a change in approach to training of future teachers. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 481 420

Research into the Teaching of Literature in a Second Language: What it Says and How to Communicate it to Graduate Students

Elizabeth Bernhardt
Stanford University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Ketchem

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Literature Learning and Teaching?

While the phrase "language learning and teaching" is a perfectly idiomatic expression in contemporary pedagogical circles, the phrase "literature learning and teaching" seems somehow awkward and hollow. Few published research studies exist on the act of foreign-language literature *learning* (Bernhardt 1990; Chi 1995; Fecteau 1999; Tian 1991) in contrast to the thousands of empirical contributions regarding the learning of second languages. By the same token, few empirical contributions on foreign-language literature *teaching* exist (Tian 1991). In fact, Marshall (2000b) notes: "We have had virtually no systematic studies of how literature teaching at the university proceeds" (p. 396). Admittedly, there are a number of technique-oriented books, such as *Literature and Language Teaching* (Brumfit and Carter 1986); *Teaching Literature* (Carter and Long 1991); and *Literature in the Language Classroom: A Resource Book of Ideas and Activities* (Collie and Slater 1987). Of course, frequent discussions of the role of literature in the contemporary foreign-language curriculum (e.g., Kern 2000; Kramsch and Nolden 1994) are to be found. These focus on the relationship between language and literature—not on literature learning and teaching per se. Questions that would parallel the *language* learning and teaching base such as ones that probe the development of an interpretive capacity in foreign-language literary interpretation; the mapping of improvement in learning; the valid assessment of literary learning; or investigations of effective practice within literature classrooms; are not actively presented in the research literature.

There are several bitter ironies here. In actuality, the most substantial portion of the postsecondary foreign-language curriculum is taken up by literature learning and teaching. In parallel to other elementary versus more advanced educational settings, this curriculum

FL 027 857

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

is focused on text or on content, not on students (Bernhardt 1995). This text focus may, in part, explain the lack of research in the area. The language curriculum has been profoundly influenced by research on human language development and has, by and large, adapted its curriculum accordingly; the literature curriculum, in contrast, remains focused on texts as objects. Adding to the irony is that, in spite of an interest in scholarship and research that breaks the literary canon, an almost ritualistic pedagogical and curricular pattern seems to be held firmly in place. Marshall (2000a) comments: "Years of anecdotal teacher reports suggest that the literature instruction teachers receive in college—the texts they are taught, the discussions that are held, the writing that is assigned—profoundly affects the instruction they provide when they begin teaching" (p. 396).

A final layer of irony restricting questions in the area of literary teaching is rooted in contemporary literary theory itself. Contemporary literary theory resists the notion of guiding student readers or of criticizing their interpretations. Reader response theory, for example, virtually guarantees that students cannot be "taught" in the conventional sense. Affective response coupled with a relatively unbridled process of relating texts to other texts shirks the notion of norms. Marshall argues the point:

> If texts are selected for instruction precisely because they may represent worlds, cultures, values, and beliefs that are significantly different from what students already know (as in much recent African American, Caribbean, Latino/a, and Asian American literature), then new pedagogies seem called for. Teachers and students, in such a context, cannot rely on a process of identification with characters or situations (these characters are like me and therefore I can identify with them). Instead, students must work through a more difficult and possibly more austere relationship with the text—and this will require a very different kind of classroom practice (p. 397).

Marshall puts his finger precisely on the major issue in foreign-language literature learning. Students are in a curriculum with which they cannot, by definition, identify—if this were not the case it would not be "foreign" to them. By their very nature, students in the foreign-language literatures come to the task of reading foreign-language literary texts from knowledge bases that are incomplete, lopsided, and, perhaps crassly stated, simply inaccurate. These knowledge bases are incomplete, lopsided, and inaccurate *linguistically/grammatically* and *conceptually* precisely because they are foreign. Yet, this linguistic and conceptual foreignness gets read in instruction (by both professors and by future professors or professors in training that is, graduate

students) as the need for more grammar courses. Further, a subtext about unsophisticated Americans who just do not know any better or who do not care all that much about the Humanities is often at play (Bernhardt 1995; Shumway 1995).

The question for this article becomes one of understanding what research has to say about these issues and then of formulating a way to integrate this research information into the professional preparation of graduate students who will become teachers of language and literature in postsecondary institutions. The central thesis of this article is the following: *graduate students must learn that they are to teach students not literature; they must understand the linguistic and conceptual framework that individual students come with; and they must learn to see that the acts of language and literature teaching are far more alike than they are different—each is an act of text construction and reconstruction based on the conceptualization of available linguistic and cultural data.*

What Research Says

The only substantial database to look toward regarding second-language literary reading is the set of studies on reading comprehension in a second language that place a particular emphasis on studies that employ literary texts. Much research in second-language reading comprehension tries to probe, from the comprehender's point of view, the nature of the knowledge structures that the nonnative actually needs in order understand texts, but probably most crucially, literary texts, in an authentic way. The first critical feature of the research base is that *the reader's current knowledge base—meaning the first-language knowledge base—is a major contributing factor to the reconstruction of a second-language text*. There are several dimensions to this contribution. First, at the linguistic level, the more literate a reader is in the first language, the higher a given second-language performance is (Bernhardt and Kamil 1995; Brisbois 1995). In other words, the higher any given literacy score (such as a Scholastic Aptitude Test [SAT] or a Nelson Denney literacy test) in the native language, the greater the probability of high second-language performance. About 20 percent of any given second-language reading performance is related to first-language ability (for a complete review, see Bernhardt 2000). In addition, this research indicates that grammatical ability matters: the better second-language readers are in the second language, the better their reading performance tends to be. While this finding might seem to be incredibly obvious, grammatical ability accounts for only 30 percent of second-language reading performance. On this note, the "more

grammar courses" argument will account for and enhance only a third of any given second-language performance.

The interaction of the first-language base with the second also continues at the conceptual level: second-language learners are able to retrieve the information from a second-language story that is compatible with first-language cultural patterns, but may not be able to retrieve incompatible information (Steffensen, Joag-Dev, and Anderson 1979). In other words, readers read from their first-language conceptual base and understand what "makes sense to them." Undergraduate readers have been known to read German literary pieces and to respond with "This isn't like Lonesome Dove" or "This isn't the triumph of man over nature as in American literature." Further, second-language readers use the sociohistorical factual knowledge that they have with second-language texts. At times, this is extremely helpful (e.g., a Vietnam veteran being able to identify with the *Trümmerliteratur* of 1950s Germany). However, it can also be destructive (identifying a married couple arguing over food as the late twentieth century American obsession over dieting versus understanding it in the context of war and starvation) (Bernhardt 1990). These examples are not meant for comic relief. They are meant to illustrate the very real cognitive consequences of reading literature in a second language. Readers will use their knowledge base; that knowledge base does not always match the knowledge base necessary for the understanding of a particular text. This is a cognitive issue, not an ignorance issue.

The second critical point from second-language literacy research is that *the knowledge base interacts with second-language linguistic abilities*. The interaction takes the form of knowledge being able to override linguistic deficiencies (meaning that readers with low-level second-language skills can in some contexts exhibit high-level comprehension abilities), but also being able to denigrate or negate actual language skills (meaning that readers with high-level language skills can doubt their own abilities when the text does not match their knowledge) (Bernhardt 1985).

As summary, the act of reading in a second language is extremely tricky—it is even trickier with *literary* texts that are inherently ambiguous, full of metaphor and intertextual relations to texts to which the readers also have no access. This is not the trickiness of the dative case or of appropriate pronunciation or even of capturing sociocultural nuances of oral language. At most levels those are directly teachable "rules" from directly observable norms. It is critical that all who teach have an appreciation of the complexity of understanding the moving target of literature.

Dilemmas of Graduate Student Pedagogical Preparation

The explosion of research and scholarship in the field of language teaching and learning experienced over the past twenty years is stunning, remarkable, and daunting. At one time, it may have been possible to boast that one had read everything there was to read in the field; such a statement is no longer realistic. This explosion, of course, is a great opportunity to understand more precisely the teaching/learning process in second-languages and to develop new ways of bringing learners to higher and more sophisticated levels of language knowledge and use. The clear downside is, however, that the graduate curriculum in language and literature departments has not expanded to accommodate this volume of new knowledge. By and large, within traditional language and literature departments, the applied linguistics contribution to the graduate curriculum is "the methods course"(i.e., a course on the learning and teaching of second languages that includes a discussion of second-language acquisition) which includes practice of the instruction in the four skills. a section on tests and assessment, and some version of field experience—either microteaching or field observation. The more modern the methods course, the less focused it is on methods and techniques, such as how to conduct a rapid-fire pattern drill or how to present the *passé composé*, and the more focused it is on linguistic development and learner performance.

A curricular structure based on an analysis of and a sensitivity toward learner development and learner performance leaves little time for a discussion of literature teaching. Another dimension to the dilemma—a dimension far beyond sheer volume of material to be practiced and mastered—is the uneasy relationship between language and literature teaching. It is indeed within the context of "the methods course" that the (future) profession is socialized into the "lang-lit split." In other words, if the only teacher preparation available is language teacher preparation a clear message is sent that language gets taught, but the corollary collocation for literature remains awkward. A further part of the message communicated within the structure of the traditional methods course is that *language* and *literature* are clearly separable units. As long as this message is sent from the outset of the graduate student socialization process, the "lang-lit split" will remain entrenched in graduate departments because those graduate students are indeed professors in training.

This situation calls for an integration of perspectives. Students need to be set on a path which enables them to think, first, about the *act of teaching* and the *process of learning*. Only after beginning to think about teaching and learning should they begin to think about

the specific subsets of teaching and learning in which they will be engaged throughout their professional lives: namely, *language teaching, language learning, literature teaching,* and *literature learning*. The remainder of this paper focuses specifically on the latter subsets, *literature teaching* and *literature learning*.

A Teaching Perspective

Graduate students must understand, first, that teachers teach and students student. Through their vehicle of studenting, students learn. The point is that there is only an indirect relationship (i.e., a mediated relationship) between what the teacher does and student learning. Most graduate students believe in a very direct relationship. Second, they must understand that for young teachers, teaching is a performance often guided by being "liked" and by the principle of being "survival oriented and activity-driven." Most graduate students believe that teaching is about *them* and the *literary text*; in other words, the text-preservation agenda seems to be foremost for graduate students and that undergraduate students just sort of happen to be there. Third, graduate students generally believe that the undergraduate students are like they are and that they are in the course to enhance their ability to analyze foreign-language literary texts. Graduate students must come to understand that this does not seem to be the case. Rather, students report that they are in undergraduate literature courses to enhance their foreign-language abilities and because they like the stories—for them it is not about literary analysis (Davis 1992; Davis, Gorell, Kline and Hsieh 1992). Fourth, inexperienced teachers must come to understand that instruction is guided by the context in which the instructional performance takes place—that institutional norms and resources play a crucial role in what can be accomplished in instruction (Bernhardt 1987). Graduate students generally think they will simply employ the model that they have been exposed to at their graduate institution to other institutions, a point documented by Marshall (2000b). This could be a reason why the teaching evaluations for young Assistant Professors suffer at the beginning stages of their careers. They are perhaps replicating their experience from their previous institution and that experience may simply be incompatible with their new institutions. Finally, graduate student-learners must understand that teachers are guided by belief systems and that their beliefs about learning—language learning *and* literature learning—will guide what happens in their classrooms. It is clear that learners (undergraduates and graduates) will rely on their previous knowledge and culturally determined beliefs. Hence, graduate methods courses must

enable graduate students to reveal their folk wisdom—about teaching, about learning, about the goals of instruction, about the ethical demands of their jobs, and so forth—and ask them to question that folk wisdom in light of research-driven knowledge.

A Literature Learning Perspective

The next topic area that should be addressed is learning. Graduate students in foreign-language departments should be made aware of the generalizations in the research literature on human learning; should be asked to relate that literature to the language learning research literature to which they are exposed; and then should be given tasks to relate that conceptualization of research to the act of literature learning and teaching. From this conflation of knowledge bases, they can develop a literature learning perspective. The learning literature (not just language learning, but learning in general) can be synthesized under seven rubrics (Kamil 1998, personal communication; Pressley and McCormick 1995): *time on task, appropriate feedback, prior knowledge, situated learning, task difficulty, multiple solutions, and release of control.*

Time on task in learning is arguably the most crucial feature in human learning. It refers to the total amount of time spent learning to do a task; it also focuses on the nature of the task. Exemplified simply, the longer one spends practicing the task of piano playing, the higher the probability of getting better at playing the piano. Further, lots of time spent practicing the piano implies improvement at playing the piano—not necessarily at playing the violin. To return to the matter at hand, time on task in literature learning means spending significant amounts of time reading and interpreting literature. It does not mean spending lots of time doing grammar exercises and then turning to literature; it also does not mean listening to someone else interpret literature. It literally means for students that if they are to become able learners and readers of literature, they must spend significant time doing whatever good readers of literature do.

A second dimension to human learning is receiving appropriate feedback. Appropriate feedback means working with a knowledgeable coach, tutor, or teacher who can make comments specific to the task at hand. Telling foreign-language students in literature classes that their language is "not very good" and that they "should spend a semester abroad" is vague and unhelpful criticism. Pressley and McCormick (1995) note: "Feedback provides information about what has been learned and what remains to be learned. The more that feedback stimulates the learners to reflect on errant responses in comparison to correct alternatives, the more likely it is to be effective" (p. 249).

Appropriate feedback in the context of literature learning has to focus on two primary dimensions. First, it refers to the nature and appropriateness of the language used to express interpretive comments; second, it focuses on interpretation itself. The former need is substantially linguistic in nature. Either in oral or written texts, students' language use needs to be monitored for its discourse features and levels of sociolinguistic appropriateness. When the discourse structure is wanting (either from the microgrammatical level or from the structure of paragraphs), literature teachers must point out the areas that are in need of work and practice and provide targeted opportunities for such practice. Whether this means commentaries such as "I'll be looking in your next paper/class presentation for a clearer and more refined use of literary-analytic vocabulary. Please refer back to the article X that we read in class and integrate some of the literary terms I called to your attention there" or comments such as "I'd like you to replace the words I've underlined in your draft with ones that we learned in X's article," the point is that literature learners are to understand that their language use needs to become aligned with interpretive language. The instructor is there to help the learner work on the development of that language.

The greater challenge with respect to appropriate feedback is providing feedback regarding interpretation. How does a teacher tell a student that he or she is off track in the interpretive process without sounding too controlling? How does one tell a student that his or her interpretation is too simplistic, too naive? Perhaps this is indeed where the science of teaching gives way to its art. Extended individual discussion with students to grasp how individual students problematize or, perhaps, whether they can problematize is central to providing them with constructive feedback that will make them better at understanding and interpreting literature. Bangert-Drowns, Kulik, Kulik, and Morgan (1991) provide convincing evidence that having learners examine their responses and comparing them with more reasonable or appropriate responses is more effective than other types of feedback. Maintaining an archive of effective responses that students can reference perhaps on a course website is a way of managing this type of feedback in a nonthreatening way.

Prior knowledge is a third critical variable in the learning process. Research indicates that learners will use the knowledge that they have already acquired as a basis for interpreting and understanding the new knowledge they are to acquire. In literature learning, this means that learners will use their knowledge of American literature, for example, to interpret Spanish or French literature and that they will use

the interpretive skills that they have acquired in other educational settings (such as twelfth-grade English) for their interpretive tasks. There is much positive to be said about the store of knowledge that learners bring to the foreign-language literature setting. It is not as if they have never encountered difficult texts with multiple meanings. Indeed, they have, and have practiced this kind of reading. That is, they come to their foreign-language literature class with a set of useful strategies. The question becomes whether these useful strategies are the most appropriate.

The interpretation of a foreign-language literature from a native-language literature can be relatively useful, but it is frequently inappropriate. As noted above, inappropriate interpretations are often received in college foreign-language literature classes as moral failings (i.e., not having enough cultural sophistication to get it "right"). In fact, research evidence indicates that when the knowledge base is off-target or nonexistent, learners often resort to the overuse of strategies (Pressley and McCormick 1995, p. 83). Bernhardt (1991) provides evidence for this from her interviews with literature students. They admit to not understanding many foreign-language texts, but readily acknowledge that they have sufficient strategic knowledge to look up interpretations in the secondary literature and to parrot them back in order to prepare and complete classes and assignments. The point is that the task of the literature instructor is to enable learners to acquire the knowledge structures they need for authentic interpretation.

Research also indicates that for effective learning to occur, that learning should be situated. In other words, learning should be relevant to the task at hand, that is, it should be in a context in which performance normally takes place. One can learn lots of techniques from practice and can learn many strategies from books. But, to be a good golfer, one must go out on the golf course. To be a good researcher, one must conduct research. What does situated learning with respect to literature look like? In its most fundamental sense, literature learning is about interpretation. If students are not asked to interpret in some authentic way, their learning will be of the most superficial kind. Questions posed to students situate the learning. The vague assignment of "Write a five-page reaction paper to the text" is nonsituated and most probably a grammar and composition task in disguise. When literary critics are asked to conduct a text analysis, their task is not to complete a grammatically correct five-paragraph essay. Rather, the task is to provide some novel insight into a particular text, referring to other texts to build an effective argument. Pressley and McCormick (1995) note:

> The real challenge is to make schooling sufficiently like the real world, so that reading, writing, and problem solving learned there are tied to important real-world situations. Many believe school should be reconstructed so that students serve as apprentices to people doing real reading of real books, real writing for real purposes, and solving of real problems (p. 182).

In other words, making the task match the real world task as closely as possible will produce a higher level of learning in students. Contextualizing an interpretation task by asking students to write a book review; to follow the development of an essay that the instructor herself is composing; or to take on the personae of a "critic" are means of situating the students' learning.

A fifth learning principle is the easy to hard principle. The question here is how to define easy versus hard within a literature perspective. Historically, a rule of thumb has been to choose texts for literature courses that are linguistically easy (i.e., subject-verb-object-easy with lots of short words). But what of conceptual ease? For example, a text with a plot, (i.e., a text where there are clear answers to *Who? What? Where? Why?*, and *How?*) may lighten the learning burden versus a text that is based on an internal monologue or one that begins at the middle of a story with anaphoric and cataphoric references. The structure of the literature curriculum is a key to unlocking several dilemmas related to difficulty. If the literature curriculum is indeed structured around an author, a theme, a genre, the text types and structures themselves become more and more familiar and, therefore, easier. Random sets of short prose pieces from multiple authors, multiple time periods, and diverse themes force students to begin again with each new text rather than being able to build systematically on what they know. The systematic build up of background knowledge will contribute significantly to lightening the cognitive load.

Next, effective learning also appears to be a result of having the learner perceive multiple solutions. In other words, in order to learn something, a learner must try things out in different contexts. Within a literature context, the tired essay form that is used to learn interpretive skills in a foreign language might not be the only solution. Other opportunities to use interpretive skills need to be provided. Dramatic readings or the placing of narrative into a dialogue form and vice versa may help learners to understand how to interpret and may provide instructors with knowledge about the interpretive directions and skills of their learners.

A seventh principle is release of control. This means that the learners must be given a chance to try literary interpretation in a

foreign language on their own. In other words, a culminating task that allows a learner to put everything together without too many guidelines for essays, too many restrictions, too much hovering feedback and grammatical correction is required to insure appropriate learning. Indeed, multiple drafts with lots of instructor feedback are important, but at some point learners need to understand that they will be responsible and on their own for an individual product ready for scholarly assessment.

In summary, graduate students should come away from a discussion of these principles with the following understandings. First, learners will develop their interpretations within the context of the sociocultural knowledge that they carry with them. This knowledge is *not* necessarily appropriate or relevant. It is, however, all that they generally have as an interpretive base. This is not a moral failing; it is a background knowledge issue. Second, learners' linguistic level will influence their interpretation. Learners are not generic, but carry with them semideveloped arsenals of word knowledge, syntax, and morphology. Third, learners' literacy level in their first language will also influence their interpretations. Some learners will be better at analysis than others. That is separate from their linguistic ability and separate from their relevant or irrelevant sociocultural knowledge. Literature instructors must learn to distinguish between "excellent written French" and "excellent interpretive skills" and insure that they are not blinded by linguistic acumen. Instructors will find excellent language expressing trivial ideas and will find spotty language depicting serious analysis on the part of their students; it is the instructor who will have to make a judgment about which of these to value.

A Literature Teaching Perspective

Marshall (2000a) argues that any literature curriculum that focuses on the Other calls for a new pedagogy—one that enables learners to cope with the "austere" relationship that they find in texts from cultures other than their own. This perspective, wedded to notions of linguistic and conceptual development gleaned from the second-language acquisition and human-learning literature, calls for a pedagogy that is focused on reader conceptualization, how that conceptualization is constructed and developed over time, and how it can be modified.

Student-readers are learners. This means that when they arrive in their literature classrooms, they will rely on prior knowledge, will respond to feedback, and will see to construct their understanding based on the classroom context in which they find themselves, and so forth. The task of the foreign-language literature instructor is to uncover the

conceptual representations of literary text that student-readers construct. Further, after uncovering the representations, the task of the instructor is to realign the representations when they are inappropriate. This task is much the same as the task of the language instructor who must try to listen for and to understand how a student has conceptualized a particular linguistic rule within automatic speech and who must then try to set contexts for the correct use of the form.

How do these conceptualizations get uncovered in a literature classroom? How can a literature instructor listen? A vehicle for uncovering representations is recall in the native language and at higher fluency levels, recall in the foreign language. The key point is that an instructor must find a way to tap the individual student's conceptualization of a literary text. There should be no interrupting questions, no interfering interpretations on the part of the instructor. What is in the text from the conceptualization of the individual reader must be the pedagogical point of departure. Whether this uncovering process is conducted in the classroom, retelling a story in writing, or by email, the point is the students must be permitted to provide an individual interpretation on which the literature instructor can base a subsequent class hour. The point of departure must be what the student understands is in the text, not what the teacher tells him or her it is about.

How does a literature instructor in training learn to listen to students? The obvious answer is by listening to students in authentic classroom settings. Yet, while the observation of literature teaching is a possibility within graduate methods courses, it is difficult to arrange literature teaching field experiences—frequently because there are not many literature classes taught at any given time in a language department, and because professors often do not wish to relinquish class hours to graduate students for practice teaching. Hence, simulation is an efficient alternative. Graduate students can be given learner-generated conceptualizations of literary texts and be asked to then conduct an analysis of these learner-generated texts using standard text-analysis techniques. Below is an example of the written recall in English of the German-language text from Franz Kafka, *Vor dem Gesetz* (1996). The learner was asked to read the text in German and then to recall the text in the language in which he or she felt most comfortable. The student, a freshman with 30 weeks of German, recalled the following:

> A doorman stands before the entrance of his building. He wears a warm fur coat, has a distinctive nose, and has a long black beard. A man from the country (he seems like a country bumpkin) asks the doorman if he can enter the building. The doorman will not let him enter. A conversation ensues between the two and the bumpkin leaves.

> The man from the country travels a great deal and after some time, he returns to the building. Meanwhile, the doorman had remained day in and day out at his mundane job. Another conversation ensues.

Generally, a set of recalls from individual students of a particular literary text like the one above are given to each graduate student. (Recalls from five separate students are enough to simulate a class.) The graduate student in the course is to imagine that each individual student is in his or her literature class and is coming to the class having read and understood the story in the manner exemplified by the recalls. The task for the graduate student is to look for and to diagnose misunderstandings arising from cultural misconstructions, linguistic deficiencies, or both. This exercise permits graduate students to use the primary research tools that they have–literary skills–for text analysis. After they complete this kind of analysis of student-generated texts from multiple perspectives, graduate students are asked to design lessons for the group of learners whose recalls they analyzed. They are asked to answer the following question: *Given what your students believe about this text, how will you proceed—in terms of sociocultural knowledge, in terms of linguistic knowledge, in terms of literary analytic skills—keeping in mind what you know about human learning?*

Implications

This approach to lesson planning for the literature classroom has rarely if ever been discussed in the foreign-language research literature. Such an approach is, however, critical in bringing about programs that are consistent with the second-language research base and that bring students to higher levels of linguistic proficiency and cultural appreciation. The end-result should be twofold. First, changing graduate students' understandings of literature learners radically changes their teaching attitudes. Graduate students often believe that their literary study and its methodology is somehow distinct from the pedagogy that they will and should use in their own teaching. The language/literature split is partially to blame for this, of course. As long as graduate students believe that language learning happens in two years and that, after two years, students can discuss great literature, there can be no claim that graduate students will naturally become successful literature teachers. Changing their beliefs changes what they believe they can accomplish in their literature teaching. Second, this approach—one that integrates notions of human learning, second-language development, and literary study—potentially leads to greater professorial job satisfaction. Graduate students will

begin to perceive the literary methodologies they currently have as useful pedagogy and feel more comfortable as instructors. They will begin to have a grasp on the inextricable link between language and literature study and no longer perceive one as a necessary evil and the other as the real goal.

Research and theory in all fields has become increasingly more sophisticated and complex. This increased complexity implies a need for new means and modes of communicating the information to graduate students and enabling them to take ownership of it. The field is at the point that a one-size-fits-all-for-all-teachers-and-all-courses approach to teaching is woefully inadequate. A course on the teaching of literature must be added to and required within the standard graduate curriculum in language departments. Structuring a course on the teaching of foreign language literature according to the belief systems and knowledge structures with which graduate students come to their own learning process should make for a satisfying experience and for more sophisticated and attentive future foreign literature instructors.

Works Cited

Bangert-Drowns, R.L., C.L. Kulik, J.A. Kulik, and M. Morgan. 1991. The Instructional Effect of Feedback in Test-Like Events. *Review of Educational Research* 61: 213–38.

Bernhardt, Elizabeth B. 1985. Reconstructions of Literary Texts by Learners of German. In *New Yorker Werkstattgespraech 1984: Literarische Texte im Fremdsprachenunterricht*, edited by M. Heid, 254–89. Muenchen: Kemmler & Hoch.

_____. 1987. The Text as a Participant in Instruction. *Theory into Practice* 26 (1): 32–37.

_____. 1990. A Model of L2 Text Reconstruction: The Recall of Literary Text by Learners of German. In *Issues in L2: Theory as Practice/Practice as Theory*, edited by A. LaBrea and L. Bailey, 21–24. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

_____. 1990. Knowledge-Based Inferencing in Second-Language Comprehension. In *Linguistics, Language Teaching and Language Acquisition: The Interdependence of Theory, Practice and Research*, edited by J. Alatis, 271–84. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

_____. 1991. *Reading Development in a Second Language: Theoretical, Research, and Classroom Perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

_____. 1995. Teaching Literature or Teaching Students? *ADFL Bulletin*, 26(2): 5–6.

_____. 2000. Second-Language Reading as a Case Study of Reading Scholarship in the 20th Century. In *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. III), edited by M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. Pearson, and R. Barr, 791–811. Mawwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bernhardt, Elizabeth M., and Michael L. Kamil. 1995. Interpreting Relationships Between L1 and L2 Reading: Consolidating the Linguistic Threshold and the Linguistic Interdependence Hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics* 16(2):16–34.

Brisbois, Judith. 1995. Connections between First- and Second-Language Reading. *Journal of Reading Behavior* 24(4): 565–84.

Brumfit, Christopher J., and Carter Ronald A. 1986. *Literature and Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carter, Ronald, and Michael N. Long. 1991. *Teaching Literature.* New York: Longman.

Chi, F-M. 1995. EFL Readers and a Focus on Intertextuality. *Journal of Reading* 38(8): 638–44.

Collie, Joanne, and Stephen Slater. 1987. *Literature in the Language Classroom: A Resource Book of Ideas and Activities.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davis, James, Lynn Gorell, Rebecca Kline, and G. Hsieh. 1992. Readers and Foreign Languages: A Survey of Undergraduate Attitudes Toward the Study of Literature. *Modern Language Journal* 73(3): 320–32.

Davis, James. 1992. Reading Literature in the Foreign Language: The Comprehension/Response Connection. *French Review* 65(3): 359–70.

Fecteau, M.L. 1999. First- and Second-Language Reading Comprehension of Literary Texts. *Modern Language Journal* 83(4): 475–93.

Kafka, Franz. 1996. *Vor dem Gesetz in Franz Kafka Erzählungen und andere ausgewählte Prosa,* 162–63. Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.

Kern, Richard. 2000. *Literacy and Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, Claire, and Timothy Nolden. 1994. Redefining Literacy in a Foreign Language. *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 27(1): 28–35.

Marshall, James. 2000a. *Closely Reading Ourselves: Teaching English and the Education of Teachers. Preparing a Nation's Teachers: Models of English and Foreign Language.* New York: Modern Language Association.

_____. 2000b. Research on Response to Literature. In *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. III), edited by M. Kamil, P. Mosethal, P. Pearson, and R. Barr, 381–402. Mawwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pressley, Michael, and Christine McCormick. 1995. *Cognition, Teaching, and Assessment.* New York: HarperCollins.

Shumway, Nicholas. 1995. Searching for Averroes: Reflections on Why It Is Desirable and Impossible to Teach Culture in Foreign-Language Courses. In *Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study,* edited by C. Kramsch, 251–60. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Steffensen, M.S., Joag-Dev, and R.C. Anderson. 1979. A Cross-Cultural Perspective on Reading Comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly* 15:10–29.

Tian, G. S. 1991. Higher Order Reading Comprehension Skills in Literature Learning and Teaching at the Lower Secondary School Level in Singapore. *RELC Journal* 22(2): 29–43.

FL027857

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").